

## REMARKS

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Voss et al. (US 3859408). Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (US 2897840). Claims 1, 13 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Roberts et al. (US 2830622). Claim 1 has been amended to include the features of claims 8 to 10, overcoming the rejection.

Claims 2, 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Akman et al. (US 4957687). Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts ('622) in view of Voss et al. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Sadr (US 4865799). Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Hoshishima et al. (US 5518035). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Torghele (US 4483815). Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Houser (US 4325355). Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Babbin et al. (US 4512942). Claims 2-7, 11, 12 and 14-17 depend on patentable independent claim 1 and are allowable for the reasons set forth above.

Claims 8-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roberts et al. ('622) in view of Sadr and Roberts et al. ('840). The Examiner states that Roberts et al. '622 does not disclose an end cap at both ends of the forming tube. The Examiner relies on Sadr to show inserting a parison into a tubular mold cavity into an end that is opposite to a vacuum end. The Examiner states that Roberts et al. '840 discloses end caps at both sides of a mold cavity to allow the interior of the hose to be pressurized within the molding cavity, and one skilled in the art would appreciate that because the ends of the hose are completely within the molding cavity when they are positioned against the end caps, they will be cured during the heating step, and the claimed invention is obvious. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The claimed invention is not obvious. Roberts et al. '622 discloses that an end plug 20 is inserted at an end of the body 14, as shown in Figure 3, to allow the hose to be inflated from a suitable source (column 3, lines 4 to 9). A second end plug is not disclosed. Nothing in Roberts et al. '622 discloses the need of a second end plug as the structure of the other end of the body 14 is not disclosed. For example, the other end of the body 14 could be attached to a continuous roll

of body material (such as, for example, the structure of Voss et al.), which would eliminate the need of a second end plug. Nothing suggests that Roberts et al. '622 would benefit or need two endcaps, and the claimed invention is not obvious.

Additionally, Roberts et al. '840 does not disclose positioning ends of a hose against endcaps during curing. The Examiner states that Roberts et al. '840 discloses end caps at both sides of a mold cavity to allow the interior of the hose to pressurize within the molding cavity, and one skilled in the art would appreciate that because the ends of the hose are completely within the molding cavity when they are positioned against the end caps, they will be cured during the heating step. Roberts et al. '840 discloses forming a hose by employing plugs 13 and 14 during a process of forming a corrugated wall 12b. The hose is then removed from a mold 17 and placed into a steam chamber S shown in Figure 12 to cure the hose (column 4, line 73 to column 5, lines 12). The plug 13 and 14 are not used during the curing process as the hose has been removed from the mold 17. Therefore, Roberts et al. et al. '840 does not disclose positioning an end cap against each end of a hose during a step of curing. None of the references teach this feature. The claimed invention is not obvious.

No additional fees are seen to be required. If any additional fees are due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-1482, in the name of Carlson, Gaskey & Olds, P.C., for any additional fees or credit the account for any overpayment. Therefore, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

**CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.**

/Karin H. Butchko/

Karin H. Butchko  
Registration No. 45,864  
400 West Maple Road, Suite 350  
Birmingham, Michigan 48009  
Telephone: (248) 988-8360  
Facsimile: (248) 988-8363

Dated: June 15, 2009